

Dear FCC:

In regard to the In the Matter of Implementation of Section 621(a) (1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, MB Docket No. 05-311

PUBLIC ACCESS: It is for the citizenry, for the populace, for the new populace, it does not sell, it does not hype, it does address multi-culturalism, inform and educate.

I work in a larger metropolitan city, access to news may seem over abundant with all the large cable companies. Access to the cities news, the county, even neighborhood groups is limited to a station or two. A good example is the work being done with new immigrants. Programs are created to inform them of events, health choices, political interviews and debates. I don't think most large television producers etc... are going to take on those tasks. Those tasks of new immigrant, English as a Second Language learners are being communicated with by the city, county, state, health care workers, immigration, via these Public Access channels in their own native language. Are they suggesting per chance they are secularists, and want to deal with multi-lingual cultures in their businesses? or have other large corporate concerns deal with multiple languages being spoken (only) creating multiple nation of origin sections? You will of course be integrated to manage that scheme of multiple nations of origin sections within the FCC, also? Is that what they are suggesting? Public access, is a necessity. The majority of new immigrants, youth, certain working fields are not familiar with internet access, most can't afford internet access, and even if they did if they don't speak the language and don't have a computer were will they learn about where to learn? A large percentage of new immigrants are addressed by their own language, remove that option and you are removing a vital communication line. Mass media has a propagandist view, for example they popularized alcohol to begin with early black and whites; they popularized nail lacquer(which is not healthy); they popularized drugs with the sixties venue; they popularized violence, sex and rock and roll. Public Access programming is a

tool. The Public Access channels use that tool to inform the public of local events, regional and even national events. The Public Access channels use that tool to communicate with new immigrants, to inform, to teach and hopefully to train. I recall Sesame street on Public Access, children learned English, there are a majority of adults who learned English with their children and Sesame Street, Zoobilee Zoo, etc... Where else can someone learn that a bid for a city contract had only one contractor bidding? Where else can you see your city council at your convenience? Not only that, accessibility issues such as hearing impairment, sight impairment, etc...can be addressed with Public Access. Close your eyes for fifteen minutes in your own FCC hearings, what do you hear? Can you hear the people next to you? The other people down a bit? What about lip reading, one person is facing yourself the others aren't, what are you listening with lip reading? Public access allows for close captioning, replay, even transcripts can be made available for translation into braille. I found a statistic not too long ago over 65% of the population over the age of 65 suffer from some type of disability. PUBLIC ACCESS: It is for the citizenry, for the populace, for the new populace, it does not sell, it does not hype, it does address multi-culturalism, inform and educate.

If it came down to it and I had a choice of public access or mass media. It would be PUBLIC ACCESS. It is that beneficial to the populace overall.

I have heard the following:

The telephone companies want to do away with local video franchise agreements between local municipalities and video providers; they claim these franchises are an obstacle preventing them from entering the "Video Service" delivery business. However local video franchising agreements are the mechanism by which municipalities ensure that cable and telecommunications companies doing business within the community are accountable to the local public interest. Video franchises ensure that communications companies offer affordable services, that they do not 'redline' less profitable areas, and that they respond to customer complaints.

Video franchise agreements are also the only mechanism that protects and ensures the existence of local Public, Educational and Governmental (PEG) access TV channels and centers. Local video franchises between municipalities and the Cable TV companies have served the community for three decades; phone companies offering Video Services must have local franchises just as the Cable TV companies do. In order to protect PEG channels and facilities, we must ensure that local municipalities have the authority to require local video franchising.